



महाराष्ट्र शासन राजपत्र

असाधारण भाग चार-क

वर्ष ६, अंक ६३]

सोमवार, ऑक्टोबर १३, २०१४/आश्विन २१, शके १९३६

[पृष्ठे ३, किंमत : रुपये ९.००

असाधारण क्रमांक ११५

प्राधिकृत प्रकाशन

महाराष्ट्र शासनाव्यतिरिक्त इतर वैधानिक प्राधिकाऱ्यांनी तयार केलेले

(भाग एक, एक-अ व एक-ल यांमध्ये प्रसिद्ध केलेले वैधानिक नियम व आदेश यांव्यतिरिक्त इतर)

वैधानिक नियम व आदेश ; यात भारत सरकार, उच्च न्यायालय, पोलीस आयुक्त, आयुक्त (राज्य उत्पादन शुल्क), जिल्हादंडाधिकारी व निवडणूक आयोग, निवडणूक न्यायाधिकरण, निवडणूक निर्णय अधिकारी व निवडणूक आयोगाखालील इतर प्राधिकारी यांनी तयार केलेले वैधानिक नियम व आदेश यांचा समावेश होतो.

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

Nirvachan Sadan, Ashoka Road,

16th July 2014

New Delhi 110 001, dated the

25 Ashadha, 1936 (Saka)

NOTIFICATION

No. 82/MT-LA/21/2009.—In pursuance of sub-section 2(b) of section 116 (C) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, (43 of 1951) the Election Commission of India hereby publishes the Judgment/Order dated 27th February 2014 of the Supreme Court of India in Civil Appeal No. 8427 of 2011 in Election Petition No. 7 of 2011 in Election Petition No. 21 of 2009 (Smt. Meenakshi Prabhakar Patil - Appellant V/s Pravin Madhukar Thakur—Respondent).

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 8427 OF 2011

SMT. MEENAKSHI PRABHAKAR PATIL

*Appellant(s)**versus*

PRAVIN MADHUKAR THAKUR

*Respondent(s)***Order**

Admittedly, the Election Petition filed by the appellant is pending in the High Court. The appellant had filed an application under Order 7 Rule 11 for deletion of certain paragraphs of the election petition. It was prayed that once the so called offending paragraphs are deleted at this stage, no trial or cause of action shall remain in support of the Election Petition.

The High Court in paragraph 3 of the judgment has observed as follows :—

“As stated above, the issues were framed on 25th October 2010. It is clarified by the said order itself that it will be open to the respondent to contend that the order of the Election Commission requiring the disclosure of assets is not mandatory and its alleged non-compliance would not render the respondent’s nomination form invalid. Thus, the Election Petition thereafter proceeded on several occasions. The evidence of production witnesses is over. The present application is taken out in the midst of the evidence. The application is also based on the judgments which were delivered even before the Election Petition was filed.”

In that view of the matter, we are of the considered opinion that the civil appeal of the appellant is wholly pre-mature as no question of law arises at this stage.

The appeal is, accordingly, disposed of.

..... J.
(SURINDER SINGH NIJJAR)

..... J.
(A.K. SIKRI)

New Delhi,
February 27th, 2014.

By order,

R. K. SRIVASTAVA,
Principal Secretary,
Election Commission of India.

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग
निर्वाचन सदन, अशोक रोड,
नई दिल्ली ११० ००१, तारीख 16 जुलाई 2014
25 आषाढ, 1936 (शक)

अधिसूचना

सं. 82/महा.वि.स./21/2009.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 43) की धारा 116 (ग) की उपधारा 2 (ख) के अनुसरण में, भारत निर्वाचन आयोग, 2009 की निर्वाचन याचिका संख्या 21 में 2011 की निर्वाचन याचिका संख्या 7 में 2011 की सिविल अपील सं. 8427 में भारत के उच्चतम न्यायालय के दिनांक 27 फरवरी 2014 का निर्णय/आदेश एतद्वारा प्रकाशित करता है। [श्रीमती मीनाक्षी प्रभाकर पाटिल - याचिकाकर्ता बनाम प्रवीण मधुकर ठाकुर-प्रत्यर्थी]।

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CIVIL APPEAL No. 8427 OF 2011

SMT. MEENAKSHI PRABHAKAR PATIL

Appellant(s)

Versus

PRAVIN MADHUKAR THAKUR

Respondent(s)

Order

Admittedly, the Election Petition filed by the appellant is pending in the High Court. The appellant had filed an application under Order 7 Rule 11 for deletion of certain paragraphs of the election petition. It was prayed that once the so called offending paragraphs are deleted at this stage, no trial or cause of action shall remain in support of the Election Petition.

The High Court in paragraph 3 of the judgment has observed as follows :—

“As stated above, the issues were framed on 25th October 2010. It is clarified by the said order itself that it will be open to the respondent to contend that the order of the Election Commission requiring the disclosure of assets is not mandatory and its alleged non-compliance would not render the respondent's nomination form invalid. Thus, the Election Petition thereafter proceeded on several occasions. The evidence of production witnesses is over. The present application is taken out in the midst of the evidence. The application is also based on the judgments which were delivered even before the Election Petition was filed.”

In that view of the matter, we are of the considered opinion that the civil appeal of the appellant is wholly pre-mature as no question of law arises at this stage.

The appeal is, accordingly, disposed of.

..... J.
(SURINDER SINGH NIJJAR)

..... J.
(A.K. SIKRI)

New Delhi,
February 27th 2014.

आदेश से,
आर. के. श्रीवास्तव,
प्रधान सचिव,
भारत निर्वाचन आयोग।

क्रमांक ईपीटी. २०१४/प्र. क्र. १२५३/१४/३३

सामान्य प्रशासन विभाग

मादाम कामा मार्ग, हुतात्मा राजगुरु चौक,
मंत्रालय विस्तार, मुंबई ४०० ०३२,
दिनांक ३० सप्टेंबर २०१४.

प्रत माहितीसाठी व उचित कार्यवाहीसाठी अग्रेषित :—

- (१) जिल्हाधिकारी व जिल्हा निवडणूक अधिकारी, रायगड,
- (२) निवडणूक निर्णय अधिकारी, १६-अलिबाग विधानसभा मतदारसंघ
(मार्फत जिल्हाधिकारी व जिल्हा निवडणूक अधिकारी, रायगड),
- (३) उप जिल्हाधिकारी व उप निवडणूक अधिकारी, रायगड,
- (४) निवड नस्ती.

शिरीष मोहोड,

अवर सचिव व उप मुख्य निवडणूक अधिकारी,
महाराष्ट्र राज्य.